[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

PROGRAM EVALUATION

ÉVALUATION des PROGRAMMES

Canada

AN EVALUATION OF KATIMAVIK:

EFFECTIVENESS

a report presented to

The Evaluation Directorate
Secretary of State

by

Terrence B. Peace, Ph.D.
Applied Sciences Corporation
504 Davie Street
Vancouver, B.C.

23 October, 1981

This study was paid for by the Secretary of State Department. Results and opinions contained therein are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the views or the intentions of the Secretary of State Department.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary 1
Introduction 2
Research Objectives 6
Research Design 7
The Instruments: A Discussion 12
The Pilot Study 16
Katimavik Goal: Service to the Community 19
Katimavik Goal: Personal Development 22
Katimavik Goal: Environmental Awareness 28
Katimavik Goal: Knowledge and Understanding 30a
Evaluation Concern: Second Language Learning 32
The Military Option 38
Major Problem: Work Projects 40
Major Problem: Field Staff Attrition 44
Major Problem: Program Development 52
Minor Problems 55
Other Concerns 60
Conclusions 62
Appendix: Deviations from the Design 63

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: The Interviews 9
Table 2: The Mail Surveys 10
Table 3: Surveys and Instruments 11
Table 4: Reliability Statistics 17
Table 5: Dimensions and Differences 26
Table 6: Alienation 31
Table 7: Conversational Understanding (English) 35
Table 8: Conversational Understanding (French) 36

PREFACE

We have examined Katimavik from several directions, focussing on goals, performance, and problems. It is inevitable that such a report should emphasize failures and weaknesses of the program; for that reason, we would like to state at the outset that we have considerable respect for most aspects of Katimavik, and most of the people we encountered.

We wish to thank those many people whose cooperation made this evaluation possible: past and present participants, field staff, office staff, sponsors, and citizens. In particular, we wish to thank Mr. Gordon Therriault and Mr. Ken de la Barre, both of Katimavik, whose cooperation and conduct throughout a difficult situation was exemplary; and Mr. Peter Wiebe of Secretary of State Department, whose support and insight made a considerable contribution to the quality of the study.

SUMMARY

In January, 1981, Applied Sciences Corporation was retained to conduct an evaluation of Katimavik. We found that Katimavik had but mixed success in meeting its four major goals: it met two (service to host communities, increased participants' understanding of Canada), failed to meet one (increased participants' environmental awareness), and had limited success with the other (participants' personal development). A secondary goal of particular interest to Secretary of State (second language learning) was also achieved.

There is a ready explanation for this mixed success. Participants spend 30 hours per week on the work projects, and these projects, while usually of service to the community, are often unrelated to the other major objectives of the program. Further, there is virtually no structured program which addresses the other objectives, and there seems to be no serious commitment to program development; this contrasts starkly with Katimavik's admirable financial control. A final major problem is field staff attrition (55% in year IV), which ensures that many of the participants are subjected to a new, untrained group leader in mid-program. These difficulties could easily cause the deficiencies observed.

INTRODUCTION

Katimavik is a program for young Canadian volunteers aged 17 to 21. Participants are recruited in a national campaign, by means of advertisements and posters. These volunteers are selected by a random process, so that several demographic variables of the Canadian population are reflected in each Katimavik group of 33 participants.

The 33 participants are sent to a rural community where they engage in community service work; they either make a physical improvement to the community, or provide social services. The type of service is determined by of the host community, via a sponsor, who is chosen on the basis of a written proposal. Work projects are designed by local sponsors who are aided by the Katimavik national and regional staffs, and are supported by them should problems arise. In the Katimavik literature, these community services are advertised as often being of an environmental nature.

The 33 participants, then, are a team which may cooperate on one large project, or fragment into many smaller work teams; the project as a whole is supervised by a coordinator. Each group of 33 is broken into three subgroups of 11 each; the subgroups live together, eat together, and perform domestic chores together, each under the supervision of a group leader.

After three months on one project, the whole group of 33 participants moves on to a new site in a different part of Canada. Three such projects comprise the Katimavik experience: two anglophone projects, and one francophone project. One of these projects may, at the participant's option, be at a military base. At the end of nine months in the program, the participants are sent home with a $1000 honorarium and a new set of experiences. These experiences are expected to encompass most of the major objectives of Katimavik.

The project sites are clustered into groups of three, called rotations; the 99 participants in a rotation may thus visit the three sites at Barrhead, Alberta; Beauce, Quebec; and Charlo, New Brunswick; in three trimesters. Confusion sometimes arises because the first site visited by a participant is referred to as his first rotation, the second and third sites as his second and third rotations. Thus "rotation" may refer to a group of three sites, or to one of the three trimesters. The context will make our usage clear.

Volunteer service is not easily sustained for nine months, especially by young people who have only recently completed high school. Powerful incentives must be offerred: these incentives include the opportunity to see a different part of the country and to be part of a group. As members of a Katimavik group, the participants are part of a micro-

community which is totally committed to volunteer work. This provides the necessary support to continue, in most cases. It also constrains the participants to work together to solve the daily problems of living, exacerbated as they are by the linguistic and cultural diversity of the participants, the lean living conditions, and the unfamiliar character of the host community. In this way, three of Katimavik's four main goals are to be achieved implicitly:

. personal development;

. environmental awareness;

. increased knowledge and understanding of Canada.

The fourth goal, service to the community, is to be achieved explicitly.

Katimavik has three layers of management: the five regional offices, the National Office, and the Board of Directors. A regional office has three main functions: management (Regional Director and Assistant Director), finance (Budget Comptroller), and project support (Regional Animator and Reserve Group Leader). A secretary makes the complement of a regional office six, except in Quebec, where the large number of projects necessitates two additional staff. The national office has seven functions: administration (three people), finance (four people), communications (one person), personnel (one person), logistics (one person), project support (three people), and translation (one person). Twelve secretaries and clerks make 26 full time positions in the

national office; there are, in addition, numerous part time positions. The Board of Directors is staffed entirely by volunteers, and is, for administrative convenience, a separate corporation: OPCAN. The Secretary of State Department grants on the order of $12,000,000 to OPCAN yearly, and this money is used solely to fund Katimavik.

Such is the conception and structure of Katimavik. Its performance is the subject of this research.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

Our intention is to examine Katimavik from several directions: how well it succeeds in meeting its goals; how well it succeeds in other areas of interest to its sponsor, the Secretary of State; how it is viewed by those most closely concerned with the program; and how it could be improved.

Specifically, our report addresses performance on seven dimensions:

1) service to the host community;
2) environmental awareness of participants;
3) knowledge and understanding of Canada;
4) personal development;
5) second language learning;
6) general attitudes towards the program;
7) problem areas.

To address these issues we began by gathering data from many sources (see Research Design). We have sifted this data for information; rather than list who said what, we have attempted to collect relevant data into usable blocks of information, using the statistics which appear illuminating. We do <u>not</u> present all answers to all questions on all questionnaires, nor do we parade statistical analyses; we avoid this tactic for fear of losing the forest in the trees.

RESEARCH DESIGN

There are three main sources of information of use to a program evaluation: observation, interviews, and records. Our design called for all three.

Records were researched to gain some insight into Katimavik's strengths and weaknesses, which in turn allowed us to design economically a series of questionnaires which were used to interview participants, graduates, drop-outs, dismissed participants, non-accepted applicants, community leaders, citizens, sponsors, group leaders, coordinators, regional office staff, and national office staff. These questionnaires were approved for content validity by Katimavik personnel, and by the Program Evaluation Directorate of the Secretary of State.

Specifically, the following records were researched: participant pre-rotation questionnaires, participant dropout-dismissal forms, field staff departure forms, project reports, and sponsors' questionnaires. All the problems characteristic of longitudinal data manifested themselves: an incomplete set of documents, documents which were often incomplete in themselves, drastically different information being available from different instruments in a series, etc. Therefore, we restricted our analysis to crosstabulation, which provided

information for questionnaire design and general information on program functioning.

The bulk of our information, therefore, came from data which we obtained ourselves. This was of three sorts: personal observation, personal interview, and mail interview.

Eight of the 33 (1980-81) Katimavik project sites were visited by one of two evaluators, chosen for sensitivity, proven interviewing prowess, and bilingual skills. One was an English speaking Canadian of Swiss descent, the other a French speaking Canadian from Quebec, providing us with information from an English point of view, and information from a Quebecois point of view. Nevertheless, while the interviewing styles and reactions to the evaluators differed markedly, the information was of a uniformly high quality, and converged to suggest the same conclusions.

During their eight visits, the evaluators interviewed all participants and field staff on the site, three sponsors, and three community leaders (school principals, businessmen, mayors, etc.) Between sites, each was also instructed to interview four rural graduates, where possible.

We also sent interviewers to talk to urban graduates from years II and III, dropouts and dismissals from years II, III,

and IV, and the more accessible year IV non-accepted applicants from three groups of 33, chosen by the same random process which selected the year IV participants. A summary is presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1: The Interviews

DESCRIPTION	YEAR	TARGET	RESPONDENTS
Participants	IV	264	191
Graduates	II	40	40
Graduates	III	40	40
Rural Graduates	II,III	32	19
Dropouts, Dismiss	II	17	22
Dropouts, Dismiss	III	17	17
Dropouts, Dismiss	IV	20	21
Applicants	IV	91	60
Field Staff	IV	32	32
Community Leaders	IV	24	19
Sponsors	IV	24	23

In addition to personal interviews, we conducted seven mail surveys. We sent questionnaires to community leaders, citizens, graduates, participants, field staff, regional office staff, and national office staff.

TABLE 2: The Mail Surveys

DESCRIPTION	YEAR	SAMPLE SIZE	RESPONDENTS
Community Leaders	I,II,III,IV	444	107
Citizens	I,II,III,IV	765	79
Graduates	II	455	70
Graduates	III	504	127
Participants	IV	726*	207
Field Staff	IV	88	39
Regional Office	IV	27	20
National Office	IV	26	12

*Based on 22 projects x 33 participants. The number actually remaining was closer to 525. At the suggestion of our client, no responses were solicited from projects on military bases.

It was obvious that considerable overlap would inevitably occur in the questions asked of each group. Therefore, we designed a series of instruments (question modules) which were combined to make up the questionnaires. This strategy

simplified design, analysis, and interpretation; however, a table is necessary to describe the complex relationship between instruments and questionnaires.

The 13 surveys were conducted with 11 instruments labelled instrument A through instrument K. The surveys and instruments are related as shown in Table 3.

TABLE 3: Surveys and Instruments

	Instruments			
SURVEY & QUESTIONNAIRE	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4
Participant Interview Sample				ABC*
Participant Mail Census				ABC
Graduate Interview Sample		AD	AD	
Graduate Mail Sample		AD	AD	
Applicant Interview Sample				AH
Dropout,Dismissal Interview Sample		ADE	ADE	ADE
Field Staff Interview Sample				CIK
Field Staff Mail Census				CIK
Sponsor Interview Sample				F
Community Leader Interview Sample				G
Community Leader Mail Census	G	G	G	G
Citizen Mail Sample	G	G	G	G
Katimavik Office Staff Mail Census				JK

*Administered in second official language.

THE INSTRUMENTS: A Discussion

Our research design required us to make many enquiries of many classes of respondents. To simplify this task, we designed a series of 11 instruments, or question modules, and combined them to form questionnaires for the 13 surveys, as indicated in Table 3.

All instruments except A and C were intended to elicit opinions about Katimavik from the respondents. Each question in each questionnaire was straightforward, in the sense that the respondent could easily lie and not be suspected of lying. This design feature limited the inferences which may be drawn from the data.

To guard against falsehood, we included a number of open ended questions to force the respondent to think about what he was reporting. Open-ended questions render outright fabrication more difficult for most people; additionally, they allow one to detect a trivial or supercilious attitude. Few questionnaires of any sort were discarded for any reason.

To ensure that our questionnaires were asking the right questions in familiar language, we submitted preliminary drafts to the five professional employees at the Katimavik B.C. Regional Office, who kindly consented to undertake the task. We then revised the instruments, translated them, and forwarded them to the Program Evaluation Directorate at

Secretary of State, and thence to the Katimavik National Office. Further changes were made as a result of this examination. A pilot study was also used to validate instruments A,B, and C. These procedures constituted our test for content validity.

Instrument C had two purposes: first, it asked questions about Katimavik, and was therefore subjected to the same tests for content validity as the other instruments; second, it served as a test of conversational abilities in the second official language. In the latter respect, content validity was assured by reference to the literature on second language learning and testing, and finally was approved by the Chairman, University of Victoria Department of French.

It is worth exploring why we chose to create our own tests of conversational French and English. First, no research by us or by the Program Evaluation Directorate was able to unearth a complementary pair of English and French tests. This deficiency alone would have been decisive, but further limitations of the existing instruments became apparent. Any conversational test must rely on the opinions of the rater, even though his ratings may be made more consistent by considering several dimensions of linguistic competence. Our tests required ratings along eight dimensions. Nevertheless, no standard norms are possible without a central facility for rating tape-recorded responses,

and these standard norms can have validity only if the same personnel remain to d the rating, and only if they take appropriate precautions against "drift". In summary, it appeared that NO standardized test existed in ANY language.

There is one last reason for designing our own test of linguistic competence. SPRS, an agency of Statistics Canada, had warned us repeatedly about "response burden", the length of time someone would need to respond to our questions. Therefore, rather than expose the participants to both an in-depth interview and a test of linguistic competence, we chose to do both at once.

Instrument A is a psychometric test, which we used to examine attitudes towards bilingualism, environmental awareness, and eight psychological variables (agency, organization, practicality, responsibility, self-control, self-confidence, risk-taking propensity, and tolerance). Again, we designed our own Instrument A for substantially the same reasons as we designed Instrument C.

No psychometric test of which we were aware contained a section on attitudes towards bilingualism, nor a section on environmental awareness. Thus, we could have used two or more standardized tests to examine eight of the ten variables, and a separate test especially designed for the other two variables, but the response burden would have been prohibitive

(especially as we were also requesting data from dropouts, dismissals, and rejected applicants). Even <u>one</u> of the standardized tests would probably have been too time consuming for many of these people. In addition, we knew of no standardized tests with both French and English versions, and no tests with French-Canadian norms. Moreover, such norms would have been useless in this case, because the population we wished to examine was a self-selected population, and the control we wished to test against was also self-selected. For these reasons, we concluded that it would be possible either to collect some information with our own instrument, or to collect none. We therefore decided to design our own instrument, basing its format on some of the more successful psychometric tests (eg. the Thorndike Dimensions of Temperament). To our delight, our test perfomed approximately as well as Thorndike's, as will be shown in detail in the next section.

PILOT STUDY

Each of instruments A and B was administered to the 60 participants at Esquimalt, B.C., on February 2, and again on February 10. On February 2 only English language instruments were available, but on February 10 we were able to provide both French and English versions. We obtained 31 usable English-English tests, and 12 English-French.

Katimavik participants seem to be quite outspoken, critical, and independent. We had to solicit their cooperation, not demand it, nor pay for it. We therefore took some pains to achieve cooperation, and in particular, maintained the strictest confidentiality. This almost certainly led to the mismatching of some questionnaires. Similarly, it was impolitic to enforce total co-operation both times. Thus, the reliability results reported are very conservative, while still being within accepted standards.

We correlated the first and second psychometric tests using Kendall's tau, a non-parametric statistic appropriate to ordinal data (such as that of a psychometric test). The reliability figures are presented in the following table.

TABLE 4: Reliability Statistics

Dimension	English-English (n = 31)	English-French (n = 12)
Agency	.53 (p=.001)	.67 (p=.005)
Autonomy	.22 (p=.1)	.27 (p=.25)
Environmental awareness	.75 (p=.001)	.54 (p=.02)
Organization	.44(p=.001)	.43 (p=.07)
Practicality	.49 (p=.001)	.31 (p=.21)
Responsibility	.52 (p=.001)	.22 (p=.35)
Risk taking	.34 (p=.02)	.48 (p=.04)
Self-confidence	.43 (p=.002)	.45 (p=.05)
Self-control	.51 (p=.001)	.34 (p=.15)
Tolerance	.54 (p=.001)	.03 (p=.88)

Only the autonomy scale seemed to be unreliable. We therefore deleted it from the test and substituted a scale of "attitudes towards bilingualism".

Concerns with validity led us to three main considerations. First, we followed the format of a known successful test, the Thorndike Dimensions of Temperament; second, we considered the questions carefully for content validity; and third, we placed considerable emphasis on reliability. We were rewarded with a test that seems to

perform about as well as Thorndike's, while avoiding a prolonged validation procedure, which would otherwise have consumed much of the budget available for the whole Katimavik evaluation and rendered the study about a year late.

The effectiveness component, instrument B, was analyzed by cross-tabulating all 43 pairs of tests. This analysis too is conservative. Only one question (#12) scored more than 21% polar switches ("yes" to "no"), and most were more than twice as reliable. Therefore, we seemed to be tapping concerns of high centrality and stability in the participants. Fortunately, these concerns were also our concerns.

KATIMAVIK GOALS: SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY

One of Katimavik's major goals is to be of service to those communities willing to host a group of participants. We considered several measures of service to the host communities, based on reports by participants, graduates, field staff, citizens, community leaders, sponsors, and regional directors. Data obtained from these sources is internally consistent, and agrees with the observations of our evaluators.

Katimavik agrees to provide services to a sponsor in one of two ways: by building or renovating some structure, or by providing a social service. Thus, the projects range all the way from the building of a ski trail, to assisting in the teaching of the mentally retarded. The sponsors' obligation is to design and supervise the work, and to provide all materials and tools required. Katimavik in return agrees to supply volunteer labour.

More than 90% of the participants and graduates surveyed stated that the work projects were of use to the host community, as did more than 80% of the dropouts/dismissals, and 80% of the field staff. Of the 79 citizens who responded to our mail survey, 25 indicated that they saw the Katimavik projects as useful or very useful, 4 found the projects of little use, and 1 found the projects useless.

Only 30 of 79 respondents answered this question, and this number may seem discouragingly small; but scarcely more than half the citizens responding were aware of Katimavik at all. We also found that the list of Katimavik project sites, provided by Katimavik's National Office, included physical geographical names with no reported population (as per the 1980 Canada Gazetteer Atlas). We concluded that Katimavik must have been minimally active in some of the communities we contacted.

Therefore, we may at least infer that Katimavik is helping some people while antagonizing few. Community leaders were both more reponsive (107 replies) and more aware. Half found the Katimavik projects useful or very useful, 5% found them of little use, and 4% found them useless. Also, few of either the citizens or leaders felt that Katimavik was unwelcome (4% and 19% respectively did not want Katimavik to return), and few (6% and 18%) thought there were more important projects which the government should address.

The sponsors were also queried at some length on the work projects. Twenty-one of 23 sponsors (91%) said unequivocally that they would work with Katimavik again. Only one was negative. More than 80% agreed that most participants were dependable, had a positive attitude, and did good work. Fewer than 25% reported that projects were not completed on schedule; and half of these blamed the weather or their own

disorganization. The only strong notes of discontent seemed to be that almost half of the participants are seen as not adequately prepared; and a few sponsors (3 of 23) felt that Katimavik was not responsive to criticism.

The regional directors provided us with a list of work projects, including labour, materials, and supervision expended on each. We were therefore able to examine Katimavik's contributions in detail. We found an impressive list of social services, and an impressive list of physical improvements to the communities. The dollar value of the latter alone is conservatively estimated at greater than $1,000,000 (see our study relating effectiveness to costs). .

In conclusion, we found that Katimavik is very successful in meeting the goal of service to the community.

KATIMAVIK GOAL: PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT

More than 80% of the participants reported that they experienced personal development in some way. The dropout/dismissals were less sure, only 65% being convinced of it. Citizens and community leaders agreed that participants developed, and so did field staff (90% and 80% respectively). The difficulty is that everyone develops at this age; our task is to determine how much of this development is attributable to Katimavik.

To rigourously consider the question of personal development, we administered the psychometric questionnaire (instrument A) to applicants, dropout/dismissals, participants, and graduates. Instrument A measured the following 10 dimensions:

1) agency (perceived power over social environment);
2) attitudes towards bilingualism;
3) environmental awareness;
4) organization;
5) practicality;
6) risk propensity;
7) responsibility;
8) self-confidence;
9) self-control;
10) tolerance.

There may, however, be other aspects of personal development to which Katimavik contributes, but which were not measured in the psychometric test. Three areas in particular come to mind: propensity for continued volunteer work; interpersonal skills (many participants, graduates, and field staff commented that interpersonal skills were vastly improved, and that this constituted their single most important gain from Katimavik); and lastly, many youths had to learn such basic skills as how to cook their own meals, skills which we did not research. These aspects will be considered later.

To analyze personal development, we examined means and standard deviations of each psychometric dimension, broken down by sex, language of response, and type of respondent (applicant, dropout/dismissal, participant, or graduate). One technique of examination was a three-way ANOVA.

ANOVA is a statistical technique based on a series of mathematical assumptions. Some of these are seldom met by a real data set; it is well known, however, that ANOVA is robust (or error resistant) to most real world deviations from its underlying assumptions. Our data was within these limits, in all respects but one.

ANOVA assumes the scales underlying the data points to have the interval property; no psychometric test achieves this

goal. Unfortunately, no literature addresses the levels of deviance from the interval property, and how these deviations affect ANOVA. Therefore, we interpreted the ANOVA with caution.

Upon examining the 10 ANOVAs, we discovered that most dimensions showed main effects of sex, language, or type, but not one of the 40 interactions reached statistical significance. This rather unusual circumstance allowed us to combine the observations by forming means for each main effect variable. However, since we were only interested in the effects of type (applicant, dropout/dismissal, participant, or graduate) on the psychometric dimensions (agency, etc.), we had only to consider means for each type, and each dimension. Five only of the ANOVAs indicated significant main effects of type, corresponding to the dimensions agency, environmental awareness, organization, responsibility, and tolerance; consequently, only these five dimensions are listed in the following table.

TABLE 5: Dimensions and Differences

Dimension	Applicant	Drop/Dis	Partcpnt	Graduate	P
Agency	2.55	2.05	3.18	3.08	.017
Environment	4.23	2.75*	4.19	4.05	.021
Organization	1.93	-.54*	1.02	1.42	.006
Responsibility	3.63	1.70*	3.24	3.25	.011
Tolerance	4.50	3.34*	4.60	4.40	.005

*denotes statistically significant difference from applicants

Interpretation is as follows. The table indicates no benefits attributable to Katimavik; however, the dropouts/ dismissals have lower scores on the last four variables. These low scores could reveal in which ways the dropouts and dismissals were incompatible with the program, but the scores could also reflect an adverse reaction to the Katimavik experience. To disentangle these two possibilities would require before and after measurements, which were beyond the study's guidelines.

In addition to the psychometric test, we attempted to measure predilection for volunteer work by self-report from participants and graduates. Seventy-three percent of the participants indicated that they would continue to do volunteer work after Katimavik, and 37% of the graduates

indicated that they had done so. Moreover, there is some outside evidence that the graduates retain their volunteer service ideals. When we contacted the United Church of Canada Caravan Program (Saskatchewan) we were told that Katimavik graduates were helping to organize the program, and that several people from their Caravan Program had expressed interest in Katimavik.

Interpersonal and communication skills are undeniably very important, but we did not research this question directly. And clearly, when the participants report personal development as a result of the program, it is these aspects to which they may refer, rather than those aspects addressed by our psychological test. Therefore, we cannot assert that personal development did or did not occurr along these two dimensions.

Last, when participants are busy learning how to cook and function in a group, it is perhaps too much to expect these gains to show up in psychological dimensions such as "agency" (the feeling of power over the social environment). As we did not address such specific gains, we do not know their precise extent. However, while such skills must be learned at some time, it is highly unlikely that Katimavik provides a cost-effective means of doing so.

Personal development comes in large measure from accepting personal challenges and mastering them; from accepting responsibility and making mistakes. In Katimavik, however, the participants are shielded from responsibility. The field staff make decisions about what to do and when to do it (with limited input from participants, in most cases); what to buy, how to budget, when to conduct vehicle maintenance. In such an atmosphere, it is somewhat surprising that Katimavik participants seem to develop more or less as other young adults, who are leaving home, going to university, etc. On the one hand, there is little evidence that Katimavik participants experience much personal development beyond that of other young people not in the program; but on the other hand, there seems to be a fine untapped opportunity for them to do so. Participants could simply be given more responsibility, both individually and collectively.

Katimavik is intended to foster personal growth in a Canadian context, and one of Canada's most salient features is democracy. In spite of an opportunity to address this issue, Katimavik does not do so; we note that a monthly assembly could discuss participant and staff concerns, and decide issues specific to the immediate Katimavik community. Issues of broader concern could be communicated to the regional or national offices. This would not only increase participants' knowledge and understanding of their political system, but would also result in personal growth: a feeling of power over

their social environment, a feeling for practical democracy, a sense of participating in the program, knowledge of the responsibilities of public speaking, verbal skills, and language skills. The list is surely not exhaustive.

Katimavik could also delegate responsibility for all routine aspects of the program to the participants. For example, by the end of the first month, individual participants could be undertaking care of finances, vehicle maintenance, driving, etc. By the end of the second month, the group leader could be mainly concerned with program development. Such a strategy should relieve some of the pressure on the group leaders, provide the challenge promised to the participants, and encourage significant personal development.

A last pre-requisite to personal development is consistency in reinforcement schedules and consistency in role models. Katimavik does not seem to be at great pains to provide either: enforcement of the rules fluctuates unpredictably; hot water taps are left dripping in the teeth of an "environmental commitment"; advertising emanating from the national office promises what the program does not even attempt to deliver (e.g. "intellectual challenge"). Such inconsistencies seriously detract from the program.

Thus, while there is evidence of some personal development beyond that experienced by non-participants, Katimavik fails to achieve its full potential.

KATIMAVIK GOAL: ENVIRONMENTAL AWARENESS

One of Katimavik's main appeals to the youth of Canada is the challenge of learning about the environment, and how to protect it. The participants, dropout/dismissals, and graduates were all asked three questions on the subject:

1) Did you use conserver technologies on the work sites?

2) Did you learn to use any environmentally appropriate technologies?

3) Are you now better equipped to live in a society of scarce resources?

Answers to these questions were a resounding "yes", in the 75% range for all groups. The first two questions were also asked of field staff, where a similar result obtained.

On the other hand, when we asked community leaders and citizens if Katimavik had made them (the populus) more aware of scarce resource technology, only 16-20% said "yes". Nor do the work projects themselves seem to have much of an environmental emphasis. Of the four project sites visited in Ontario, Quebec, and Nova Scotia, only one project had

anything to do with the environment, and that was tree planting. Finally, when we measured the participants' attitudes towards the environment on instrument A, we discovered no difference between the attitudes of participants and the attitudes of non-participants.

There is no hard evidence that Katimavik raises environmental awareness in more than a few of the participants. We observe a large positive response to the straightforward questions, but no apparent change in underlying attitudes.

KATIMAVIK GOAL: KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING

Awareness of Canada was tested by several questions in the participants' questionnaire, as well as by a comprehensive test designed for this purpose. The latter was not to be analyzed for this evaluation because norms had yet to be obtained. However, we asked a number of questions concerning this aspect of the program: seven questions of the participants, dropouts/dismissals, and graduates, two of the field staff, and one question of the citizens and community leaders. Most measures indicate a meeting of this goal.

Katimavik participants have a fine opportunity to learn about Canada; they travel, they share accommodation with people from all over the country, and from different socio-economic classes. Participants, dropouts/dismissals, and graduates reported that participants in their groups came from 4-6 regions, and that only 15-30% felt that their fellows were of the same socio-economic class. More than 75% in each category felt that they had learned something about the communities in which they had lived. The field staff agreed with this latter assessment, and indicated that they too had been broadened by Katimavik.

When asked whether they were more aware of Canada's problems, and whether they wanted to help solve them, about

80% in each category answered affirmatively. But only about 60% of the graduates and dropout/dismissals felt that Katimavik had made them more aware of current events, while half the participants felt that they had somewhat lost touch while in Katimavik.

The last question concerns alienation from other Canadians. Here we found a startling difference between anglophone and francophone participants, in that about half as many anglophones as francophones felt alienated.

TABLE 6: Alienation

	MGRAD	MPART	IGRAD	IPART	IDOD
Francophones	39%	22%	13%	31%	39%
Anglophones	10%	16%	7%	12%	11%

The five cryptic column titles translate as follows:
MGRAD: responses from the mail survey of graduates;
MPART: responses from the mail survey of participants;
IGRAD: responses from the interviews of graduates;
IPART: responses from the interviews of participants;
IDOD: responses from the interviews with dropouts or dismissals.

Unfortunately, we have no way of knowing if this alienation is caused by Katimavik (although some volunteered that Katimavik had shown them how necessary separatism was), because we do not know how prevalent this feeling is amongst francophone youth. However, it does indicate that some measures might be taken to combat this negativity.

We feel justified in asserting that Katimavik does increase awareness of Canada, but that the goal could be better met if more emphasis were placed on bilingual communication and exploration of host communities.

EVALUATION CONCERN: SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING

One aspect of Katimavik of particular interest to the Secretary of State is the language skills program. Katimavik attempts to teach at least some French to the anglophones, and at least some English to the francophones. Mastery of at least one offical language is assumed. Before we proceed to examine this question, two caveats are in order: we were not able to test the language skills of <u>any</u> participants before they began a rotation at a second language site, much less to conduct before and after language tests; and the teaching of second language skills is not one of Katimavik's primary objectives. Therefore, a number of assumptions must be made in order to infer anything whatsoever from the data, and major

emphasis on this aspect of Katimavik would be unfair to the program.

We shall assume that all of those who had been exposed to four or fewer years of the second language acquired their conversational skills in Katimavik. This assumption is made reasonable by the data which indicate that some of those who had taken the second language in school were totally unable to converse in that language, even after Katimavik. We are led to conclude that at least 78% of the francophones and 53% of the anglophones became at least minimally competent in conversing in the second language (see tables 7 and 8). This is much more conservative than our interviewers' impressions, which are that about 90% improved their mastery of the second language to some extent. The participants and graduates supported this view, with proportions in the 85% range. However, both the field staff and dropout/dismissals were considerably less sanguine, reporting improvement in only about 50% of the cases. As we were unable to test the participants before and after their involvement in Katimavik, we cannot say whether these figures reflect a mere difference of criterion or a real difference of opinion. A safe conclusion is that at least 50% of the participants did indeed improve their linguistic skills. Quoting from one interview,

> "M.H. could not converse in English before Katimavik. One of her personal objectives has been to learn a second language and she has succeeded remarkably well. Her

second language skills could be qualified as 'fairly bilingual'."

While this is atypical, it indicates the enthusiasm that some participants bring to the task, and the spectacular results that can be achieved by the program.

We rated linguistic competence along 8 dimensions:

1) accurate use of idioms;
2) accurate use of articles;
3) acurate use of comparisons;
4) accurate use of tense and verb forms;
5) accurate connecting of phrases;
6) economy and accuracy of expression;
7) accurate pronunciation;
8) conversational understanding.

We felt that the last of these, conversational understanding, was the most revealing measure of increased conversational competence (and the eight measures correlated so well that this table represents virtually sufficient statistics). Values of understanding are crosstabulated with years of study (0 to 7; 8 corresponds to 8 years or more, and 9 is the code for missing data). A separate table is provided for native anglophones and for native francophones. Note that six francophones could not speak English well enough to take a language test and 31 anglophones were similarly incompetent, and two were so bilingual as to be unable to specify a 'first' language, yielding a total of 189 valid observations.

TABLE 7: Conversational Understanding (English)

LANGC 08/06/81 PAGE 18

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/06/81)

CROSSTABULATION OF V29 BY V3

CONTROLLING FOR.. V1 VALUE = 2.

PAGE 1 OF 1

ENGLISH SPEAKERS

V29 UNDERSTANDING	V3 YEARS OF PREVIOUS INSTRUCTION										ROW TOTAL
	0.	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	
1. GOOD	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	0	7
	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	14.3	0.0	57.1	0.0	8.3
	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	16.7	0.0	28.6	0.0	
	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	1.2	0.0	4.8	0.0	
2.	3	1	1	3	3	3	2	2	5	6	29
	10.3	3.4	3.4	10.3	10.3	10.3	6.9	6.9	17.2	20.7	34.5
	27.3	14.3	12.5	33.3	30.0	33.3	33.3	66.7	35.7	85.7	
	3.6	1.2	1.2	3.6	3.6	3.6	2.4	2.4	6.0	7.1	
3.	5	5	2	3	4	5	1	1	3	0	29
	17.2	17.2	6.9	10.3	13.8	17.2	3.4	3.4	10.3	0.0	34.5
	45.5	71.4	25.0	33.3	40.0	55.6	16.7	33.3	21.4	0.0	
	6.0	6.0	2.4	3.6	4.8	6.0	1.2	1.2	3.6	0.0	
4. POOR	2	1	5	3	3	0	2	0	2	1	19
	10.5	5.3	26.3	15.8	15.8	0.0	10.5	0.0	10.5	5.3	22.6
	18.2	14.3	62.5	33.3	30.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	14.3	14.3	
	2.4	1.2	6.0	3.6	3.6	0.0	2.4	0.0	2.4	1.2	
COLUMN TOTAL	11	7	8	9	10	9	6	3	14	7	84
	13.1	8.3	9.5	10.7	11.9	10.7	7.1	3.6	16.7	8.3	100.0

TABLE 8: Conversational Understanding (French)

LANGC 08/06/81 PAGE 17

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 08/06/81)

CROSSTABULATION OF V29 BY V3

CONTROLLING FOR.. V1 VALUE = 1.

PAGE 1 OF 1

FRENCH SPEAKERS

V29 UNDERSTANDING	V3 YEARS OF PREVIOUS INSTRUCTION										ROW TOTAL
	0.	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	
1. GOOD	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	1	2	2	10
	0.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	20.0	0.0	10.0	20.0	20.0	15.2
	0.0	0.0	33.3	50.0	14.3	18.2	0.0	8.3	28.6	15.4	
	0.0	0.0	1.5	1.5	1.5	3.0	0.0	1.5	3.0	3.0	
2.	1	1	2	0	4	2	2	7	3	4	26
	3.8	3.8	7.7	0.0	15.4	7.7	7.7	26.9	11.5	15.4	39.4
	20.0	25.0	66.7	0.0	57.1	18.2	100.0	58.3	42.9	30.8	
	1.5	1.5	3.0	0.0	6.1	3.0	3.0	10.6	4.5	6.1	
3.	2	2	0	1	1	4	0	3	2	4	19
	10.5	10.5	0.0	5.3	5.3	21.1	0.0	15.8	10.5	21.1	28.8
	40.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	14.3	36.4	0.0	25.0	28.6	30.8	
	3.0	3.0	0.0	1.5	1.5	6.1	0.0	4.5	3.0	6.1	
4.	2	1	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	2	9
	22.2	11.1	0.0	0.0	11.1	22.2	0.0	11.1	0.0	22.2	13.6
	40.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	18.2	0.0	8.3	0.0	15.4	
	3.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	1.5	3.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	3.0	
5. POOR	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	3.0
	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	
	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	
COLUMN TOTAL	5	4	3	2	7	11	2	12	7	13	66
	7.6	6.1	4.5	3.0	10.6	16.7	3.0	18.2	10.6	19.7	100.0

Everyone agreed that it was desirable to have both anglophone and francophone sites for Katimavik projects. But more than 10% of the participants and graduates reported that they had not visited one! Our evaluators were convinced that this reaction was genuine, as many of the "francophone" sites outside Quebec were completely bilingual, and put no pressure on the participants to learn French. This seems to be one of the three good reasons why francophone participants gain more than anglophones in this area (the other reasons being, two anglophone rotations to one francophone, and easier access to anglophone media). Most graduates admitted that they spoke the other language only a few times a week, but our data indicates that francophones were significantly more active than anglophones.

Our evaluators found that francophones seemed more interested in second language learning than anglophones, and made the greater advances. Possibly because of resentment at this imbalance, the francophones tended to form cliques. This might be avoided by ensuring that everyone attained some minimal level of competence, and providing more useful program materials (the Living Language materials and the language games in the program manual do not appear to be adequate).

In spite of these difficulties, we estimate the cost of providing equivalent second language learning to be on the order of $2,000,000. This is discussed at length in our study relating effectiveness to cost.

THE MILITARY OPTION

The military option is reasonably well received by participants. Seventy percent said they would do it again, more would recommend it to a friend. Graduates felt similarly, but more positively, whereas the figures were lower (50%, 70%) for dropout/dismissals. Of course, one must qualify this by noting that participants volunteer for the military option, so that one would expect them to feel positively about it; and our figures confirm that most had a good, or at least a neutral opinion of the military before the program. What is more revealing, perhaps, is that not one of this year's participants responded that he had a lower opinion of the military after the military option, and few of the graduates or dropout/dismissals (a maximum of 20%) reported a lower opininion either. The military base officers also seemed to approve of Katimavik; although we interviewed none, at least 70% of each participant category felt that base officers were favourable or neutral towards the projects.

Consider the difference between the civilian and the military projects. The latter are highly structured (which we believe is desirable), but authoritarian. Participants in the military option learn more about gun safety than conservation, areas widely considered opposite; but note that conservation is a major Katimavik interest. Participants perform no community service, providing neither social service nor

physical improvements. The field staff are well paid, professional military people. Civilian field staff sometimes refer to them, and to the military option participants, as fascists. We note a certain degree of divergence between military and civilian projects. Perhaps the military should consider sponsoring its own form of Katimavik.

The main problem seemed to be transition from military to civilian projects. About one third of all categories reported problems here, but there was little agreement on what to do about it. However, a number of people suggested a debriefing when leaving the military option, and a specific introduction to the civilian projects; some even suggested omitting the military option in the first rotation. The latter seems too extreme, but the former seem sensible and workable.

Suggestions for improvement were contradictory, and no pattern emerged (the most common suggestions were "treat participants more like regular army" and "substitute Katimavik objectives for military objectives"). We may conclude that the military option has few problems peculiar to itself, and that it does not have the more serious problems which bedevil the civilian projects.

The second problem which seems worth correcting is the agreement Katimavik participants must sign to enter the military option. It specifically authorizes the military to

conscript previous military option participants, for a full year after they leave the base. This seems a treacherous and unnecessary infringement of liberty, although it is more likely a simple oversight on the military's part, caused by using a standard form for Katimavik. But some thought could be given to changing it.

MAJOR PROBLEM: Work Projects

There is an implicit bargain between Katimavik and its participants: the recruitment literature promises certain enriching experiences, and in return for these, the participant agrees to donate his volunteer labour, and abide by certain restrictions on his behaviour. If a participant feels that either he or Katimavik is not cleaving to the bargain, then he may curtail his involvement in the program, and may even leave. Even if he does not leave, curtailment may take the form of disrespect for the rules, low motivation, etc.

Having made this bargain with Katimavik, participants arrive at the site with their group leader. There they begin a wholly unfamiliar routine. Much is different from their expectations. Unfortunately, many also find that Katimavik is not keeping its part of the bargain: 32% of participants stated that work programs were deficient in terms of

organization, supervision, or supply of materials and equipment. In corroboration, nearly 60% of the field staff reported that more sponsor planning and supervision was needed. Thirty-seven per cent of the participants felt that the program could better address its objectives, and 60% of the field staff felt the same way.

For example, the challenge the participants had been told to expect did not materialize at an average of one project in three (estimated from our evaluators' observations). The appropriate technology project often did not come to pass (see "Environmental Awareness"). Some of the work projects did not seem appropriate for various reasons (mainly of use to private enterprise, meaningless, etc.). More than half of the participants have one of these experiences. Some turn off.

Strangely enough, participants' suggestions for improving the program had little in common with what they said was wrong with it. They catalogued a list of shortcomings, including disorganization of projects, lack of freedom, and meaningless work projects; yet they suggested "better" selection of participants and field staff, and only rarely talked about structure and objectives. But better organization implies more structure, and better selection of participants implies that some are deficient (i.e. unmotivated). Yet, would unmotivated people apply? It seems more likely that participants lose motivation during the program.

Although field staff also tended to criticize the motivation of participants (40%), they also find that the program suffers from lack of on-site organization; half said that planning was poor or insufficient, and half said that the program materials from National Office were only fair or poor. A further third indicated that sponsors did not supply adequate equipment support for their projects.

Participants repeatedly mentioned that sponsors did not have enough work for them to do, and cast about for "make work" activities. For example, one group said that in an arctic winter they had been required to clear a road by hand, a road with no clear beginning and no terminus (Fort Simpson, 1981). Others told of sweeping streets and doing janitorial work in civic buildings for rich communities (Bromont, 1981). Participants reported being required to do hazardous work without adequate safety equipment: operating chain saws without protective gear, and bleaching logs without skin protection (Seigneurie Pabos, 1981).

Their criticisms seem reasonable. They did not volunteer to do heavy labour in bad conditions, labour which could be done in a day or two by machinery. It is difficult to value heavy work invested in a product lacking function. And most unfortunate, it is difficult to maintain ideals about volunteer enterprises in such circumstances.

We must note that volunteer workers are not rewarded for awaiting instruction, as is a paid worker. The reward for a Katimavik worker is the work. Hence, participants expressed dissatisfaction with a project deficient in meaningful work opportunities, and expressed satisfaction with projects at which meaningful work was provided.

We have tried to make the case that supervision by the sponsors is of critical importance (as reported by sponsors, participants, and field staff), simply because work projects are such a large part of Katimavik. Generally, participants are willing but inexperienced workers. They must be shown how to do most of the work. When they are finished a task, they often do not know what the next one should be, or how to go about it. Thus, when supervision is lacking, so is a product, so is pride, so is reward.

Katimavik seems to have trapped itself by becoming unreasonably tied to its sponsors. It is as if Katimavik preferred any physical work, no matter how useless, degrading, or exploitive, if sponsored, to something begun on its own initiative. In a few cases however, the participants and field staff have created their own projects. Our evaluators reported from their observations that these projects seemed invariably successful, if for no other reason than that the participants initiated it themselves (for even a pragmatic failure can be a personal success).

In conclusion, work projects are the core of the Katimavik program, and deficiencies in the work projects cannot be tolerated. The important deficiencies to avoid are meaninglessness, etc., and lack of supervision. If sponsors cannot supply enough adequate projects, then Katimavik must; either by encouraging participants and field staff to do so, or by intervening at the regional level.

MAJOR PROBLEM: Field Staff Attrition

Katimavik has been plagued by problems of field staff attrition since its inception. Although precise figures are not available for the first two years, we estimate that in the first year, the number of field staff leaving the program after training camp was 50%; in the second year, 60%; in the third year, 45%; and in the fourth year, 55%. One should also note that attrition has been measured in two ways: including or excluding those who left during training camp. We shall use the more conservative figure.

There are two principal classes of employees at Katimavik: office staff and field staff. The former are mainly administrative and semi-professional staff, who have careers to consider; the latter are people who will almost certainly not stay long with Katimavik (very few have stayed as long as three years). It seems only common sense to give

higher salaries and benefits to these semi-professionals, if only to attract and keep good personnel. However, this good strategy is incomplete.

A complete policy of salaries and benefits would include looking after the administrators and semi-professionals, and looking after other indispensable staff. But consider the case at Katimavik. Administrative and semi-professionals are reasonably well looked after. The field staff are told repeatedly that they are the most important people in Katimavik, yet

1) they are severely overworked, by <u>any</u> standards;
2) they are relatively underpaid;
3) their salary increases are lower (in percentage) than <u>any</u> permanent office staff;
4) their benefits are less comprehensive than <u>any</u> permanent office staff;
5) they have almost no effective holidays or weekends for nine consecutive high pressure months.

Therefore, they resign in droves. This last process is referred to as "field staff attrition".

Given these facts, one is led to ask how important the field staff really are; does this high turnover rate affect the program significantly? Or is it cost-effective to exploit them?

Field staff attrition has three deleterious effects on the program: sullied public image, impaired program functioning, and reduced cost-effectiveness. Field staff spend a great deal of time with the sponsors and the community. Therefore, their attitudes towards Katimavik, and Katimavik's treatment of them, are clearly visible to the public. High turnover of dedicated individuals alone is enough to damage Katimavik's image, but the resultant inefficiency and even disorganization inevitably lead to a poorer public image than the program merits. Three of 24 sponsors criticised Katimavik specifically for this problem.

Field staff attrition also affects program functioning in three main areas: communication, planning, and organization. More than half the field staff responded that communication either within Katimavik, or between Katimavik and the community, was problematic, and 9% of the office staff agreed. Note that field staff attrition and communication problems aggrevate each other, in a positive feed-back loop: the poorer the communication, the harder it is to deal with problems; problems increase frustration; and the greater the frustration, the greater the attrition; conversely, the newer the group leader, the greater the communication problems. Further, a few field staff have volunteered the common sense position that good communications begin at the start of the year, and new people have difficulty integrating.

language and she has succeeded remarkably well. Her

Again, more than half the field staff expressed dissatisfaction with planning; difficulties here are aggrevated by new personnel seldom being able to provide continuity in terms of either work projects or discipline. This lack also affects organization, whether or not the new group leader has been adequately trained; and most are not. Participants volunteered that it takes a new group leader about two months to take over effectively from someone else, and those field staff reporting tended to support this view.

If the program suffers from poor planning and disorganization, it will not meet its objectives as well as it could. Therefore, field staff attrition has a cost, typically calculated as an opportunity cost (what a policy costs relative to known alternatives). One aspect of opportunity cost is the loss sustained when trained staff resign.

There are two training camps at the beginning of the Katimavik year; if we assume that these are cost-effective, then the loss of trained field staff is significant. Moreover, field staff improve as they learn on the job, and some even remark that on-the-job learning is the only way to master a group leader's skills. If we assume that it does take about two months for a group leader to learn his job, with 54 group leaders leaving after participants arrive (as in year IV), we note that (54/90 x 2/9 =) 13% of the program is being run at marginal efficiency because of this problem

and two were so bilingual as to be unable to specify a 'first' language, yielding a total of 189 valid observations.

alone. Doubtless further losses accrue to untrained coordinators taking over midway through the year. We will show in the study relating effectiveness to cost that this exploitation of the field staff is not even cost-effective.

Several explanations for field staff attrition have been offerred: incompetence, unsuitability, and "burn-out". Remedies for the first two are obvious: better selection and better training. On the face of it, the remedies have not been terribly successful. We are told that the last has been addressed by internal reports; we observe that it has not been addressed by action.

The current stategy for dealing with field staff attrition is as follows: field staff are mainly selected on the basis of demonstrated skill in management and youth leadership, and partially on the basis of familiarity with the regions in which they will function. Those selected are sent to a ten day training camp sponsored by the regional offices, addressing project preparation, budgeting, and administration. They then attend an eight day training camp sponsored by the National Office, at which rotational work and the nine month work plan are discussed. Three of four coordinators interviewed by one evaluator volunteered that the training camps did not prepare group leaders to deal with field problems.

The training camps should be reconsidered. As we were not retained to address this problem, we do not have precise ideas about how the training camps should be changed. However, we note that the field staff surveyed suggested that they need colleagues who are more flexible, less authoritarian, older, more experienced, dedicated to youth, possessed of better leadership qualities, less parental, more caring, and better organized. We note further that program materials would be very useful in meeting certain of Katimavik's objectives; consequently, some knowledge of teaching and teaching materials is desirable. Some of these desiderata can be taught; the rest could be selection criteria, either before training camp, or in the training camp itself. It would not be hard to have the most unsuitable individuals learn that they were unsuitable before they caused grief to themselves and others.

A second strategy is to address "burn-out". "Burn-out" is the mental and emotional exhaustion caused by looking after (supervising, chauffeuring, 'parenting') 11 participants, usually only a few years younger, 24 hours a day, seven days a week, for three months. After three months the group leader typically has a few <u>hours</u> to recuperate before facing the next group. Burn-out is exacerbated by poor support from fellow field staff (many of whom have neither the time nor the energy); scant support from the regional office (only the Regional Animator is available for five to eight projects);

few 'resource people'; low salaries (the 120 civilian field staff earn less than the 53 regional and national staff); and perceived low status within the organization.

The crux of the matter is more time off and better pay. Although the materials from the National Office direct group leaders to take 24 hours off per week, these instructions are seldom followed. Anyone with children knows why: when one lives with those for whom one is responsible, demands are made incessantly. It is the rare individual who can refuse.

The only alternatives, then, are either to physically remove group leaders from the site for one day a week, or to have extra staff take over the responsibility. The latter has several advantages:

1) more supervisory people present;

2) field staff could allow themselves sick leave;

3) a large pool of trained field staff, which could be replenished without trauma;

4) ongoing supervision of Katimavik houses.

Specifically, one extra group leader per site should relieve most of the frustrations intrinsic to the job. This extra group leader could rotate through the three groups at a site for one year, before taking on full responsibility for a group. He would thus gain the benefits of a comprehensive training, amounting virtually to an apprenticeship, before

relating effectiveness to cost.

undertaking an inherently stressful job. We were told that this suggestion was made in Year II.

Were this the first year of a new program, such a deplorable situation could be mentioned and forgiven. This is, however, the <u>fourth</u> year of Katimavik; the inequities have been exaggerated; and realistic solutions to the "field staff attrition" problem have not been applied. Yet the money is available: about $1 million is returned to the sponsoring agencies annually, and executive salaries increase. One seems forced to conclude that "field staff attrition" is not a serious concern to the Katimavik National Office, nor to the Board of Directors. We believe it should be.

MAJOR PROBLEM: Program Development

Minor delays in the work projects are inevitable, and these may release large amounts of leisure time for the Katimavik participants. This extra leisure should be used to achieve program objectives. Although the materials published by the National Office attempt to meet some of these needs, their success is not uniform, largely because of a lack of structure. Such structure as does exist is provided by the work project. When it fails, so does the program. Katimavik should be made more robust.

Objectives such as mastering a second language or mastering a technology, becoming more aware of the environment, and to a lesser extent personal development, require study, effort, and concentration. They also require clearly stated long and short term goals. These are the essentials of a curriculum; and curricula, with their formal and rigid schedules, are either lacking or inadequate. They could hardly be otherwise, as not one person in the organization is exclusively involved in program development. This contrasts markedly with the nine staff solely concerned with finances.

In conclusion, a curriculum should be provided for each major objective, and time allotted to each. We suggest that

the following paragraphs be considered by those who will be responsible for developing curricula.

Personal development is one of Katimavik's goals. The first step in designing a curriculum to address this goal is deciding what to emphasize. For example, instruction is currently available in self-management techniques such as time management, stress management, and making personal goals operational. Since considerable weight is put on communication skills, the participants might also profit from a short session on active listening.

Knowledge and understanding of Canada could easily be increased by a curriculum. Materials should stress the areas which participants will visit; some of this could be delegated to the individual group leaders, but they should be explicitly told which topics to address. Francophone and anglophone cultures could be compared, contrasted, and discussed. Multiculturalism could be considered in the context of Canada, Belgium, and Switzerland.

Environmentally appropriate technology is one of the most developed areas of the program manual, yet the staff do not seeem to stress it adequately, probably because the manual does not treat more difficult and interesting projects as completely as simpler ones (39 pages on composting seems excessive). This could also be a profitable area for

internally sponsored work projects, which would necessitate more complete documentation.

Nutrition and health are also addressed at some length in the program manual. Notable gaps, however, appear. The health section has no section on stress management, which is very important to group leaders at least. More critical is the complete lack of a section on vegetarian diets. Since some groups become completely vegetarian early in the program, the malnutrition caused by a poorly considered diet could prove serious. A comprehensive section, outlining the dangers and describing nutritionally complete diets, should be included.

Finally, it seems inappropriate to encompass all of this in one manual for two reasons: different projects will need different materials, and second, the manual would otherwise be too long. The current manual is a considerable step in the right direction, but should be altered and augmented.

MINOR PROBLEMS

It seems that some judges are in effect sentencing young offenders to Katimavik. It is unclear that detention is compatible with Katimavik goals.

Sometimes a worthwhile project suffers for lack of a few thousand dollars for tools, etc. Katimavik might consider a special fund for this purpose.

Katimavik often pays inflated rents for housing, so that sponsors can provide materials and equipment. Of course, this leaves the sponsor, not Katimavik, in possession of the tools.

If inflated rents are continued as a means of subsidizing sponsors, Katimavik should make sure that the sponsor benefits in every case. We were unable to obtain figures on this point, and can only suggest its possible relevance.

Katimavik is spometimes hosted by very rich communities. Such service as is rendered is therefore relatively superfluous.

Many sponsors view Katimavik as free labour. They could be innoculated with the Katimavik goals, if not the Katimavik spirit.

Sponsors should be active in assisting Katimavik. At a minimum, sponsors could introduce each new rotation to the community, and help with housing, public relations, etc.

It is known in the literature that sponsored programs tend to displace local volunteer labour after two years (Palmer, J.L., ed. "Creating Jobs: Public Employment and Wage Subsidies", Brookings Institute, 1978). Therefore, Katimavik should consider moving on after a maximum of two consecutive years in any location.

Much is made of physical conditioning in the Katimavik advertising, but we found many female participants complaining of 20 pound weight gains. Partly, this is caused by recreational eating in a merry group atmosphere. A truly adequate nutritional guidance program might have a mitigating effect.

Health food fadding is also common, and sometimes leads to vegetarian or near vegetarian diets. Unfortunately, most vegetarian diets are deficient in one or more of the amino acids essential to human life. A section in the program manual on vegetarian diets might prevent problems in this area.

There is a great deal of smoking in Katimavik houses. In some houses, neither bedrooms nor the dining room (even at meal-time) are smoke free zones. This is dangerous and offensive to many.

Enforcement of the rules fluctuates from site to site. The problem is that these rules are not site rules, tailored to the communities and the individual participants; they are national rules, supposed to apply equally to all sites. This puts the field staff in the unenviable position of appearing hypocritical when breaking inappropriate rules (e.g. against hitch-hiking), or like martinets when enforcing them.

Occasionally, long field trips of 1000 miles or more are indulged. The participants, being used to sacrifices, see these as junkets. These long trips, therefore, detract from the program.

A young person who helped stuff envelopes for us claimed to be a 1979-80 (year III) graduate of Katimavik. He was not on any of the year III lists. This forces us to doubt the completeness of Katimavik records. Moreover, when our representative arrived at the Katimavik National Office on January 21, she found the staff in the process of destroying records. She requested that this activity cease, and it did. Nevertheless, certain questions of propriety arise.

According to one third of the 1980-81 participants, Katimavik projects sometimes benefit private enterprise. This is hardly in keeping with the Katimavik spirit. Work projects should be better selected.

Katimavik currently selects participants according to five demographic variables, in the following order of priority: province, sex, language, town population, and family income. Clearly perfect balance is impossible, but we feel that family income is more important than town population. Perhaps this priority could be reconsidered.

In addition to what they should do, field staff should be made aware of what they should not do. They should be made aware of the dangers their work projects will present, and they should also be made aware of the dangers of playing amateur psychologist, the dangers of forcing their participants to play encounter group (Fort Frances, 1980).

Participants must sign a form to enter the military option. It reads, in part,

"I hereby engage to serve the Canadian Reserve Forces for

A. An indefinite period of time commencing on the

day of 19 .

B. Continuing full time service for the duration of an emergency and any period when I am on active service and

for one year thereafter if my services are so long required." (underlining added.) To subject Katimavik volunteers to military call-up seems inappropriate.

The $1 per day spending money was doubtless adequate in 1976, when instituted. It is not enough today.

ASK

ERRATUM

page 60, line 4: "No one knew why he" should read
"Many did not know why they"

being run at marginal efficiency because of this problem

OTHER CONCERNS

Applicants

Only half of the people who apply to Katimavik are accepted. Therefore, about 1000 people per year must be refused. We interviewed 60 of these, from year IV (1980-81).

More than 80% were disappointed. No one knew why he had not been accepted; the more secure thought that Katimavik must have very high standards, others felt inadequate. The latter response should be expected in people of this age group. As participants are selected at random, subject to certain demographic variables, this labelling is manifestly undeserved and unfair, as well as discourteous. Rejected applicants should be made aware of the selection procedure, and should be assured that personal attributes are not selection criteria.

Most applicants reported having found an adequate alternative, either work or school, in spite of many hearing of their rejection only after the program had started. This apparent lack of courtesy could be partially eliminated by sending all correspondence by registered mail.

Dropouts/dismissals

When irreconcilable conflict arises between the group and an individual, the individual leaves the group either voluntarily or involuntarily. In some cases the line may be unclear, and different people may legitimately have different opinions. Nonetheless, 21 of those 60 whom we interviewed agreed that they had been dismissed from the program. Sixty percent of the dismissals thought it unfair, and half of those remained bitter. Fifteen percent had been dismissed for drug abuse, but felt that they had been singled out; our evaluators thought this assertion could easily be correct. While such feelings are inevitable, and do not necessarily reflect badly on the field staff, group leaders must be at pains to be impartial about dismissing offenders. Much of the bitterness might be avoided by giving one clear, written warning before taking action.

CONCLUSION

We have assessed Katimavik's performance against its goals and, in the process, highlighted what we believe to be deficiencies in policy or execution. The four major goals are achieved with mixed success: on the positive side, service to the community is met; participants' knowledge and understanding is probably increased; and most participants acquire some knowledge of the second official language. On the negative side, personal development seems confined to communications skills and commitment to the volunteer ideal; and environmental awareness is not increased relative to other young people not in the program.

This limited success seems to result from problems of realization rather than problems of conception. We have identified three problems which have a large impact on the program: field staff attrition, inappropriate work projects, and poor program development. A number of other problems, though serious enough to demand attention, do not of themselves imperil the program.

We think that Katimavik could, given attention to its deficiencies, meet all of its goals. These deficiencies do not appear insurmountable.

APPENDIX: Deviations from the Design

Few studies follow their research design to the letter, and the more complex the design the greater the deviation. Our evaluation of Katimavik was designed to gather data from many sources, and so was complex of necessity. We discuss the resultant deviations in the following paragraphs.

We anticipated beginning the gathering of data on March 1, but were not authorized to begin until April 22; by April 22 there were a scant nine weeks remaining in some Katimavik projects. For that reason, we strained to put our evaluators in the field by May 1, which we did. This left nine calendar days to make final drafts of the 11 instruments, have them typed, translated, printed, collated, sorted into questionnaires, and compiled into evaluators' bundles. Mistakes were inevitable. Fortunately, all but a tiny portion were recoverable.

The first mistakes were with translation. Those questions which were in fact translated, were translated well; but some questions were not translated at all. We caught all but a few of these before they went out; specifically, a question in "C" was transposed; questions were re-ordered on "F", and one question omitted from the English version; questions were renumbered on "G"; a block of questions was ommitted from the French version of "I", but the mistake was rectified almost immediately; and a classification question

was omitted from French "J". Printing errors also complicated matters. Some "A"'s went out with only 80% of their questions; some "D"'s went out similarly incomplete. When all the data was in, however, we found that less than 1% of the data was missing because of these omissions and errors.

Other human errors also contributed to the statistical error. One evaluator forgot to administer the questions from "C" to the field staff at two sites. One evaluator missed a sponsor, and only 19 of 24 community leaders were interviewed. After an extra three and a half weeks in the field, the evaluators were recalled, and the search for cooperative rural graduates terminated after finding 19 of the targetted 32. Of the targetted 91 applicants, we were only able to interview 60. Others indicated willingness to cooperate, but broke appointments, or had moved, or were unwilling to cooperate, or were on vacation. We sent questionnaires by courier to those who could be reached no other way, but the first one returned August 17, far too late for analysis.

The last major departure from the design was caused by the mail strike (June 30 to August 10). Of the 22 project sites we did not visit, only 11 responded to our mail surveys (either before the mail strike or by courier). Moreover, four of these were referred by the Katimavik National Office, and some of these questionnaires bore incontravertible evidence of

tampering: pages of comments had been removed from some questionnaires. Last, the number of citizens and community leaders responding was doubtless smaller than it would have been, had the mail strike not occurred; nevertheless, the eventual return rate was 24%, which we feel permits but small response bias.